

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

Indiana OIC State Council

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Lesson matches original description	² <i>Approaching Standards</i>	Criminal Background Checks	<i>In Compliance</i>
Recruiting Materials	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Instruction is clear	² <i>Approaching Standards</i>	Health/safety laws & regulations	<i>In Compliance</i>
Academic Program	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Time on task is appropriate	² <i>Approaching Standards</i>	Financial viability	<i>Non-Compliance</i>
Progress Reporting	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	² <i>Approaching Standards</i>		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Student/instructor ratio:	³ <i>Meets Standards</i>		

As of the 2008-2009 school year, Indiana OIC State Council will no longer be providing SES programs to Indiana students.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Indiana OIC State Council
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: April 25, 2008

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	BOTH of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>) -Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>) -Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)	-Resumes -Tutor contract -Training agenda and materials	X		-Tutor contract is appropriate and in line with provider application; -Although training materials were provided, provider was unable to provide documentation tutors attended trainings; -Although most tutors met IDOE's tutor qualifications, one tutor did not meet the provider's criteria for tutors.
Recruiting materials	TWO of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Incentive policy -Program description for parents -Recruitment flyer	X		-Incentive policy is appropriate and in line with IDOE's Incentive policy; -Program description for parents is in line with provider's application; -Recruitment flyer states students are tutored by "licensed teachers in reading and math skills", however, based on the resumes submitted, not all tutors are certified teachers (2 out of 7 were not).
Academic Program	ONE of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following:	-Lesson plan -Description of connection to Indiana Academic Standards	X		-No lesson plan was prepared or available for one of the two observed lessons; -The lesson plan submitted for the other observed lesson matched the activities reviewers observed during onsite visit and

	-Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.				included the state standards that would be covered during the session, and details regarding the assignments and activities each student would complete during the lesson; -Lesson plan activities appear to connect to both Math and Language Arts standards.
COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Progress Reporting	ALL of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	-Progress reports -Timeline for sending progress reports -SES Contract	X		-According to the one school district served by this provider, provider did not submit progress reports timely; -Progress reports include standards upon which students will work during sessions, updates on progress students made, student strengths and areas in need of improvement, assessment results, and comments regarding behavior and attendance.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	ALL of the following: -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards	-Description of learning plan development process -Individual Education Plans and assessment results	X		-Learning plan development process appropriately includes using assessment results, parent and teacher feedback, and student performance to identify skill gaps and create a plan to address areas in need of improvement; -Learning plans include assessment results and list standards upon which students will work. However, while learning plans list standards targeted for each student, the plans do not include specific measurable goals related to these standards. In addition, learning plans do not share specific strategies, materials or resources that will be implemented by tutors to help students achieve their goals.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Indiana OIC State Council
SITE: Concord Community Center; IPS#54
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): G.E.; C.W.
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 2

DATE: March 19, 2008; April 8, 2008
REVIEWER: S.T. & S.F.
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:30 p.m.; 3:50 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			<p>-At both sites, small groups of students worked independently on worksheet packets that focused on language arts or math activities. Tutors explained that the worksheet packets were developed based on pre-test scores for each student and each student had their own folder of worksheets. As students worked on their packets, tutors periodically checked in with some students and answered questions when/if they arose;</p> <p>-Although parts of the observed lesson were in line with provider's application, this was not the case for all of the lessons. For instance, as stated in the application, students completed lessons building math and language arts skills. However, while the application describes Open Court Reading (with “explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics and word knowledge, comprehension skills and strategies, inquiry skills and strategies, and writing and language arts skills and strategies”), Reading Aloud and Listening Activities (with” games and exercises”) as curriculum and instructional methods that would be used for language arts and reading, tutors were not observed using any instructional methods during lessons. Students were only observed to be working independently on worksheets with tutors interacting with them to answer questions or explain directions.</p>
Instruction is clear		X			<p>-Although tutors periodically reviewed directions on worksheets for some students, tutors did not communicate what the main objective of the worksheets was or connect the worksheets to larger skills, concepts, or standards so that students had a clear understanding of what was to be learned;</p> <p>-Although tutors spent time with students providing guidance on how to complete</p>

					worksheets, tutors did not provide instruction to students. Tutors did not teach skills, provide detailed explanations or offer strategies to students to help increase their level of understanding. In addition, beyond the fact that the worksheet packets for each student were based on individual student pre-test scores, no other means of individualization or differentiation in instruction was observed. Each student received the same level of guidance from tutors (i.e. explanation of directions or information that was requested in worksheets) although it was clear due to the difficulty some students were having that there were sometimes large variations in ability levels between students. For example, one student requested assistance from a tutor several times, however, the tutor repeatedly responded “You know how to do this” instead offering the student different strategies when the student continued to state he/she did not understand the concept. Another example is when one student was working on a worksheet on identifying and writing words. The student asked for assistance and the tutor shared that the student should just think of words that began with a certain letter. The student stated he/she could not think of any words that began with this letter but the tutor simply repeated the same directions and did not offer any other strategies or alternate instruction to accommodate this student’s needs. Yet another example is when a student was working on a “fill-in-the-blank” worksheet and the student had a great degree of difficulty selecting the appropriate words for each blank. Even though the student continued to share that he/she did not know which words to select, the tutor repeatedly encouraged the student to pick the word that “made sense” and did not offer strategies (i.e. use context clues, etc.) the student could use to select the best response.
COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Time on task is appropriate		X			<p>-A couple of students completed their worksheet packets with little redirection necessary from tutors. However, the majority of the students had to be redirected to stay on task because they were socializing or distracted (one student played with a small rubber ball periodically, one student had his/her head down briefly, a few students played with each other, etc.). Most students were not truly engaged in their lessons as evident by the high degree of distraction and off task behavior that began immediately after the tutor left them to work with other students;</p> <p>-Although tutors did monitor behavior and redirect students when they were off task, the techniques used (usually requests for the student to return to his/her worksheet packet) were typically not an effective means for engaging students and promoting time on task for students.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			<p>-Although tutors clearly understood the materials covered in each worksheet packet, tutors were not always effective at translating this knowledge into instruction. Tutors did not tie worksheet activities to larger standards or concepts to help students clearly understand what they were learning. For example, while tutors explained or clarified directions on worksheets, tutors did not actually provide instruction or lessons on</p>

					<p>concepts covered in the worksheets. In addition, tutors did not have lesson plans available to provide a framework for the day's lessons for students;</p> <p>-Tutors were not observed using tutoring techniques such as individualized, modified or adjusted instruction during lessons when it seemed apparent these types of adaptations would have been beneficial to students operating at different ability levels;</p> <p>-While tutors did redirect students, often students returned to the same off task behavior or distractions when their tutor's attention was directed elsewhere. Tutors used the same strategy of asking the students to return to completing their worksheets (which appeared to be somewhat ineffective for some students and completely ineffective for other students) to promote time on task rather than using an alternative strategy when it became clear that the initial strategy was not working (as noted by repeated requests to the same student(s) to remain on task).</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 4:1			X		<p>- Student/instructor ratio matched that reported in the original provider application;</p> <p>- Small group instruction was observed.</p>

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Indiana OIC State Council
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: April 25, 2008

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	ALL of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks	X	
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Parent Release Form -Evacuation map -Policy & Procedure Parent Agreement	X	
Financial viability	ONE of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Verification of liability insurance -Provider did not submit audited financial statements or tax returns to document financial viability by deadline specified.		X